DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 272 RC 017 818

AUTHOR Field, Teresa T.
TITLE Establishing Professional Development Schools: Forging School/University Partnerships in West Virginia.
SPONS AGENCY Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 66p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Laboratory Schools; *Program Development; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Benedum Project; West Virginia; *West Virginia University

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the development and implementation of plans to establish professional development schools (PDS) in West Virginia. The conceptualization of this project began with consultant recommendations and faculty discussions at West Virginia University (WVU) concerning needs for reforms in teacher preparation and in the public schools. The consensus was that improvements in preparation programs had to occur simultaneously and in conjunction with schools. A team of WVU faculty and public school teachers and administrators formed in early 1988 to propose criteria to select PDS--regular public schools with which the university could work intensively. The team visited other collaborative projects around the country, identified opportunities and barriers in the creation of PDS, proposed pilot PDS projects in clinical experiences, and conceptualized the elements of a 5-year development plan. Following project funding by the Benedum Foundation in December 1988, a new team of university and public school educators was formed to clarify the nature of PDS, develop the belief statements that would guide PDS interactions and activities, develop the PDS application and application process, and select and train the review team that would recommend PDS sites. In November 1989, applications were mailed to all 70 schools in the four-county area around WVU. The review team selected six schools as PDS sites. This paper contains 13 references, PDS belief statements, and the PDS application form. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325272

ESTABLISHING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS: Forging School/University Partnerships in West Virginia

Teresa T. Field
Associate Director for Professional Development Schools
The Benedum Project

College of Human Resources and Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1990.

PC017818

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Teresa T. Field

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ESTABLISHING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS: FORGING SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Teresa T. Field
Associate Director for Professional Development Schools
The Benedum Project

College of Human Resources and Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Introduction

This paper describes and examines the development and implementation of plans to establish Professional Development Schools in West Virginia. It is one of five papers prepared for the symposium session entitled *Linking Theory, Research and Practice in Teaching and Teacher Education: A Collaborative Experiment in Educational Reform* that was presented at the 1990 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Specific components of this paper include: an historical account of activities, roles, and responsibilities of key individuals; the identification of issues that surfaced during the process; successful factors; and the author's personal reflections on the events presented from the perspective of an experienced classroom teacher. The time period encompassed by this paper is from the early 1980's to February, 1990, when the University selected six school sites to become Professional Development Schools.

Pre-Planning Grant Period: 1984 - March, 1988

Important events that led to the establishment of Professional Development Schools are described in full in Phillips and Wolfe (1990) and summarized in Lovell (1990) as follows:

> As Phillips and Wolfe (1990) have reported, the conceptualization of this project began in faculty activities to address the University's invitation to join the Holmes Group. After the College of Human Resources had hosted several presentations by individuals who had undertaken reform projects in their own institutions, the College held two day-long faculty retreats to discuss the Holmes Group goals and the needs for renewal in professional preparation and in public schools. These discussions yielded a consensus that neither could be effectively addressed in isolation from the other; improvements in preparation programs had to occur simultaneously and in conjunction with changes in schools. This was a view that

faculty had heard expressed several years earlier, when John Goodlad, serving as a consultant for academic long-range planning for West Virginia University, had reported his recommendations for future directions for the College of Human Resources and Education and had framed his counsel in relation to the extensive study he later published as *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (Goodlad, 1984).

Goodlad's specific recommendation to establish "key schools," which were regular public schools with which universities and colleges would work intensively, and The Holmes Group goals 4 and 5, "To connect schools of education with schools" and "To make schools better places for practicing teachers to work and learn" (The Holmes Group, 1986), were influential in the conceptualization of the Planning Grant proposal submitted to the Benedum Foundation. While this grant initiative was encouraged by the President of the Benedum Foundation and spearheaded by the Dean of the College of Human Resources and Education and her staff, the University administration's support for working with schools was reinforced by the University's 1986 designation of *Education Reform and Public Schools* as one of five strategic planning priorities for the future of West Virginia University.

The first stage of the Benedum Project has been funded by a one million dollar grant from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. The project's goals are: (1) To reconceptualize those programs that prepare teachers and other education professionals to make these programs intellectually sound and congruent with one another, (2) To establish professional development schools that will bridge the gap between research and practice in the profession, and (3) To establish collaborative processes, strategies, and structures that will make the changes last. An historical account of the events that led to the selection of Professional Development School sites follows.

Planning Grant: The Professional Development Schools Team

The Professional Development Schools Team that functioned during the Planning Grant made significant contributions to the form and substance of later efforts to establish Professional Development Schools. Co-Chaired by the Superintendent of Schools for the county in which WVU is located and the Dean of the College of Human Resources and Education, this team reflected in its composition the collaborative nature of school-university partnerships. Public school members included two classroom teachers, two principals, and two superintendents from other counties. WVU faculty members included two from Education Administration, one from Curriculum and Instruction, one from History, and the Director of the Division of Counseling and Clinical Studies.

The PDS Team's activities began with a review of the Planning Grant proposal, an overview of the total project structure and efforts to date, discussion of the charge to their team, and review of the team's action plan. This group was charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Identifying opportunities and barriers in the creation of Professional Development Schools.

2. Proposing criteria to be used in the selection of schools to become Professional Development Schools.

3. Proposing pilot projects in clinical experiences that can be implemented in school(s) interested in becoming Professional Development Schools. These pilot projects would serve as smaller versions of the collaborative whole-school involvement that would characterize the Professional Development School and would provide very useful information about how to expand to the total school/ university collaboration.

4. Helping to conceptualize the elements that should be included in the five-year development plan for establishing Professional Development Schools.

("Professional Development Schools Team Report," 1988, p.1)

During the time from April 29 through May 21, 1988, members read relevant literature, reflected on their experiences, participated in site visits to collaborative projects (University of Louisville and Jefferson County Schools in Kentucky; Puget Sound Educational Consortium, the Center for Educational Renewal, and the National Network for Educational Renewal in Seattle, Washington), wrote about their perspectives on Professional Development Schools, and engaged in a two-day synthesis meeting to organize the content of their report and recommendations.

Some of the opportunities the PDS Team identified in establishing Professional Development Schools were the following:

> ...The development of a shared vision of education and the profession, coming from shared leadership of practitioners and higher education members, creates a promising, positive opportunity to generate reform from the education community rather than from the political sector of our society.
>
> Professional Development Schools will provide educators a greater voice in decision making. This involvement will

bring about a sense of ownership and empowerment which should have a direct impact on the classroom.

We could develop a new way, a new approach, to restructure the way we view education that would cause us to move forward to an internal renewal model for change.

The key is staff development, and there are tremendous opportunities for mutual development for the novice, the experienced, the expert teacher and the university teachers and researchers. Clinical components for pre-service and inservice teachers are a good example of long-term staff development programming.

By joining responsibility for the beginning, the experienced, and the expert teacher, we are confirming that we are all in one system, and we can think in terms of developmental stages instead of institutional assignments or levels of traditional responsibilities.

Mutual research, inquiry, staff development, renewal, and contributions to the progress of students and of the profession are likely outcomes of the PDS. Exchanges of faculty between the university and the schools should aid infusion of best current practice and research in both settings.

Through increased interaction between the schools and the university, there is likely to be:

- greater congruence between preparation and practice, since specific strategies will be used to link program with field practice;
- more innovation, change, and improvement in both institutions;
- greater potential for significant change in the ethos, the culture, of both institutions;
- increased self-consciousness (awareness of practice and inquiry, e.g.) among participants;
- new and better approaches to teaching, learning, and inquiry in schools and in higher education. (pp.4-5)

The Planning Grant PDS Team also identified potential barriers in establishing Professional Development Schools:

Establish truly shared decision making.

Build ownership through participation.

Empower participants and assure that projects are built by them, not imposed from the top down.

Provide the opportunity for people to practice what is new over an extended period of time.

Inappropriate expectations about how soon and how much we can accomplish may be a barrier...There is a danger that people will think that the PDS will solve all of the problems, and solve them quickly.

Change community expectations about the function of education...Our efforts in collaboration may not improve test scores, and the public has been trained to consider test scores the yardstick of educational quality.

We have to broaden understanding of ours as a global society and of the intimate relationship between education and economic development...We need an adult education focus, too.

If teacher organizations aren't involved early, and if their involvement isn't handled well, it could become a barrier.

The institutional misconceptions of the roles, norms, and culture of each are barriers. Public schools and the University must come to a better understanding of each other's vision, mission, purposes, and norms; of what is shared by both and what is unique to each.

Higher education hasn't acknowledged or rewarded faculty service to schools as an important function, as valuable as research and teaching. (pp. 6-8)

The Planning Grant Team proposed as a central criterion for selecting schools to become Professional Development Schools "the acceptance of a set of standards and beliefs such as those hammered out by representatives of higher education and of public schools in the Louisville/Jefferson County collaborative." ("Professional Development Schools Team Report," 1988, p. 9) They also emphasized that, while the Louisville standards were very appealing to the Team, "it is critically important that we develop our own standards and beliefs." Citing research on successful educational change, they noted that innovations that are imported in their entirety and without local adaptation are likely to fail. They viewed the development process as an important change activity, a way to demonstrate shared decision making, and a way to build "ownership in the concept and operation of

the collaborative"("Professional Development Schools Team Report," 1988, p.9).

The group also recommended four specific provisos related to acceptance of the standards and beliefs. A minimum of 51% of the teachers in the applicant school will need to vote in favor of becoming a Professional Development School, and teachers will have to be informed about the nature of a PDS before being asked to vote. The building principal must have veto power; if the principal doesn't endorse the concept and standards, the school cannot become a PDS site. Both the school board and the superintendent must also endorse the belief statements and approve the school's becoming a PDS. The last proviso addressed the importance of College and University endorsement of the standards: "The President, Provost, and Deans must support PDS" ("Professional Development Schools Team Report," 1988, p.9).

As the Planning Grant PDS Team discussed other aspects of site selection, they agreed on several conditions for participating schools and districts. Willingness to implement shared decision making, to offer both financial/material and human resource support, and to "establish a long-term relationship if they commit to becoming Professional Development Schools" were conditions the Team believed should be required of participants. They recommended including some schools with records of excellence, having a balance of rural and non-rural schools and of elementary, middle, and high schools as PDS sites, and being sure that the student population of schools selected includes children with special needs and/or difficulties. A final comment was that geographic proximity to WVU might have to be a criterion for selection of sites in order to allow for the kind and quality of clinical work envisioned for the PDS.

Pilot projects were suggested by the Planning Grant PDS Team and included some general initiatives and some quite specific ones. Among the more general projects proposed were the development of standards and vision, a project aimed at barrier reduction, cadre development for the mutual understanding of the culture of the schools and of the University, projects encouraging the involvement of Arts and Sciences faculty, action research projects whose focus would be jointly determined, projects that build on strengths, projects that take advantage of prior successful development work, projects involving the use of technology to solve problems, and outcome-oriented projects. More specific suggestions included developing tutoring programs addressing equity in schooling, writing across the curriculum, Writing to Read, evaluation of computer software, etc.

The last activity of the Planning Grant PDS Team's two-day synthesis meeting was to identify the critical elements in the effort to

establish Professional Development School. Briefly presented in survey order, the critical elements that emerged were as follows:

- Shared decision making
- Empowerment of participants
- Using a collaborative approach throughout
- Overcoming barriers such as regulations and rules
- Using existing data and good practices
- Emphasizing mutual benefit to schools and university
- Using new technologies
- Building flexibility
- Being responsive to new ideas
- Mechanisms to develop broad ownership of the process
- Incentives to encourage retainment of personnel
- Mechanisms for hearing and attending to other perspectives
- Clarity about expectations
- Emphasis on trying, with permission to fail
- Focus on systematic change
- Attention to understanding the change process, its requirements and its outcomes
- Focus on capacity-building in structural changes and funding
- Community participation
- Knowing the beliefs parents and teachers hold about education
- Having motivational speakers to bring diverse groups together around common goals

(pp. 13-15)

The report of the Planning Grant Professional Development Schools Team and the reports from other Planning Grant Teams were then used for major concepts and directions incorporated into the proposal for the Benedum Project, as guidance for initial planning and activities undertaken by the Benedum Management Planning Team when the Benedum Project began, and as an important source for the parallel teams of the Benedum Project were oriented to their tasks and undertook their work.

Planning and Organizing Initial Activities: 1/89 - 6/89

As Phillips and Wolfe (1990) have explained, the proposal for the Benedum Project was developed immediately after the Planning Grant Teams completed their work, and the proposal was submitted to the Benedum Foundation during the summer of 1988. The announcement of the grant was made in December, 1988, and the Project began on January 1, 1989. The first Project group formed was the Benedum Management Planning Team, composed of the Principal Investigator, Project Director, Associate Directors, and Assistant to the Director.

Between January and June, 1989, the Benedum Management Planning Team (BMPT) identified and completed a number of organizational and planning tasks to facilitate progress toward establishing Professional Development Schools. In their discussions, the BMPT often relied upon the Project proposal and the insights and recommendations in the 5/24/88 report of the Planning Grant's Professional Development Schools Team.

Filling the Associate Director Position: In their first meeting on January 5, 1989, the BMPT discussed the vital importance of specifying the essential qualifications of the individual who would have major responsibilities for work toward establishing Professional Development Schools, the Associate Director for Professional Development Schools. The initial idea of reconvening the Planning Grant PDS Team to decide specific qualifications and when and how to recruit applicants for the position was revised, and, in their January 18, 1989 meeting, the BMPT decided to meet with a much smaller, *ad hoc* group to offer their counsel on the Associate Director position and several other concerns to be addressed in establishing Professional Development Schools.

In agreement with that BMPT decision, an evening meeting was held on January 24. Attending, in addition to the BMPT members, were a teacher and a superintendent who had served on the Planning Grant PDS Team and an Education Administration faculty member who was familiar with public education in West Virginia and had also chaired one of the other Planning Grant teams. The group's agenda was composed of items related to the position of Associate Director for Professional Development Schools and to the location of PDS sites in the early phase of the Benedum Project. Major points of the deliberations reported in the document *Professional Development Schools Planning Meeting Summary of Discussion*, January 24, 1989, are presented below.

The discussion of the Associate Director position, began with exploring the implications of the fact that funding for the position was guaranteed for only two years. The group observed that if the person selected were from higher education, the source of salary would shift from state-appropriated to soft money; for someone from public schools, there might be problems with going on leave and losing seniority and, later, returning to a less desirable or less appropriate assignment. The consensus was that the two-year limitation might affect the applicant pool.

A second factor addressed was the importance of the Associate Director's being credible in both public school and university settings, and the group discussed the pros and cons of selecting a public school or higher education person for the position. The group agreed that "the answer really hinges on the particular person," and that two

factors had to be considered: "credibility of selection and credibility of action." Whoever became Associate Director had to be someone who was "strong enough to work with both management and teachers." Traditionally, they noted, people in public schools "are used to being told how to do things by people from higher education." After thinking through the various possibilities, the group agreed that someone now or recently from public schools would be their first choice.

Developing the position description to be used in the search for the Associate Director was a third item on the agenda for the evening. The statement below was provided to focus discussions of the desired qualities and attributes:

> This is a key leadership position, and the person who fills it will be working with public school people, hammering out agreements about what we believe about teaching and learning, developing a shared vision about how we should make decisions, how we communicate, and how we work with teachers and students. ("Professional Development Schools Planning Meeting Summary of Discussion, 1989, p.2)

The group identified a number of items in four categories (skills and knowledge, qualities, beliefs and orientation, experience) as important, and these were incorporated into the position description that was later used in the search.

A fourth factor discussed was the relative importance of having someone from West Virginia fill that position. Part of the discussion dealt with the Project emphasis on lasting organizational change that will be undertaken, not by new people brought in, but by those who are the regular members of the organizations. However, the group predicted that the experience of being Associate Director for this innovative Project would change the person, and it would be unlikely that he or she would return to the former role. Knowledge of and experience in the state were viewed as assets, in part because the individual would have less to learn; however, overall qualifications were most significant. The group agreed to search both outside and within West Virginia, because familiarity with the state "should not preempt the search and selection process." (p.3)

Suggestions for the composition of the Search Committee were also proposed in this meeting, beginning with the agreement that the public school members should total one more than the total higher education members. They suggested a number of roles to be represented on the Search Committee. From public schools, they proposed the roles of building administrator, teacher, parent, school board member, and county office administrator. From higher education, they suggested representation from across the University and a senior teacher education student. They also thought a

representative from the State Department of Education might serve and that a member of the BMPT should be *ex officio* on the Committee.

The discussion of locations for Professional Development School sites in the early phases of the Project covered a number of political, resource, educational, and morale considerations. Choosing some distant sites would counter beliefs that the PDS concept can work only close to a university and might encourage adoption of the concept and processes. If not sites for total implementation, could more distant schools serve a different function, such as dissemination? On the other hand, success is vital, and more distant locations might stretch resources too far to provide the level and kind of commitment needed to implement and support Professional Development Schools. No conclusions were reached about locations, although a list of ideas and considerations was developed.

In meetings and staff assignments following the January 24 counsel session, the BMPT carried out the development of materials and other planning needed for the search for Associate Director of Professional Development Schools. The Assistant to the Project Director provided the majority of staff work in support of the search. First steps were to draft the position description and position advertisements. These drafts were reviewed and revised, along with a search plan, and the position was first advertised in the April 5 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, as well as in *AASA Leadership, Education Week, The Charleston Gazette, The Dominion Post*, and *The Pittsburgh Press*. A May 15 deadline was established for applications.

Responding to the announcement, a total of 61 people from around the United States and from British Columbia applied for the position. The Search Committee, as determined by the January 24 recommendations, reviewed dossiers and, by June 20, had narrowed the list of qualified candidates to four. Each of these finalists was interviewed by the Search Committee, the Principal Investigator, BMPT members, members of the new PDS Team (described below), and interested WVU faculty.

When the interviews had been completed and the Search Committee had reviewed information from these various sources, they recommended as their top candidate a teacher from one of the area's junior high schools. She had recently been selected as the county's Outstanding Teacher, had been chosen to participate in the State Department of Education's first Teachers Academy and had been a staff member for subsequent Academies, had designed and provided Academy-like inservice experiences for teachers in several other counties, and was regarded by colleagues as an expert and knowledgeable teacher. Her personal energy and enthusiasm, as well

as her fine relationship with administrators, were also factors in the decision.

Recruiting PDS Team Members: Throughout the period from January to June, 1989, the BMPT worked on recruitment of members for both the PDS Team and the seven program development teams. Several factors were very important in the composition of all Project teams: 1) participation should be voluntary, 2) individuals should be asked to list their preferences for team membership, 3) all teams should be interdisciplinary in composition, and 4) all teams should have both public school and University members.

To begin the recruiting effort within WVU, the Project's Principal Investigator and the Director met individually with the Deans and other key administrators of each school and college involved in teacher preparation to describe the Project, to gain insights into best ways to introduce the Project to faculty in that unit, and to ask the administrators' support in encouraging their faculty to participate. BMPT members had worked together on the development of information packets (letter of invitation to join, Project description, Team charges, Team choice form) that would eventually be sent to all faculty in Arts and Sciences, Agriculture and Forestry, Creative Arts, Human Resources and Education, and Physical Education. Recruitment began in the College of Human Resources and Education, where the majority of faculty who had participated in the earlier Planning Grant were assigned. Some unanticipated delays were encountered, and recruitment in other units of the University was not completed until late April. Phillips and Wolfe (1990) have provided a more detailed description of this phase of recruitment.

A critical concern of the BMPT was the recruitment of public school members of all Project Teams and, particularly, of the PDS Team. Progress toward this end was, of course, affected by the fact that the Associate Director for Professional Development Schools had not yet been appointed, and the two circumstances continued to interact. What could the BMPT initiate regarding the PDS Team before the Associate Director was hired? What progress could be made in groundwork for PDS by the Team? How could the Project be truly collaborative during this period if public school representatives were not yet identified and participating?

Meetings of PDS Team: The BMPT, acknowledging the importance of public school involvement in the Project, also recognized that there were some basic tasks that could be undertaken that would not constrain options for public school members later on. Therefore, an orientation meeting was held on May 12, 1989, for the WVU members who had volunteered for the PDS Team. One outcome of that session was to plan a second meeting, in June, to which members of the Planning Grant PDS Team would be invited. The Dean

of the College of Human Resources and Education and the Superintendent of Schools for the county in which WVU is located served as Co-Chairs of the PDS Team at this time, and this second meeting yielded plans for preliminary support work for the complex development tasks associated with choosing PDS sites. Plans were also made to bring in two consultants, Drs. Ric Hovda and Linda Shelor, from the University of Louisville/Jefferson County collaborative for two days in July.

Action: 7/89 - 1/90

Five activities during the period from July,1989 through January, 1990 are described in the following narrative: clarifying the nature of Professional Development Schools, developing the belief statements that would guide Professional Development School interactions and activities, developing the PDS application and application process, electing and training the Review Team that would recommend PDS sites, and reviewing and selecting those sites.

Clarifying the Nature of Professional Development Schools:

A first step toward achieving the Benedum Project goal of establishing Professional Development Schools was to try to develop in the PDS Team, the university faculty and the public schools personnel involved a clear understanding of the PDS concept and a general sense of how to put that concept into action. The project proposal provided a description of some of the characteristics and outcomes that were intended for Professional Development Schools:

> The Professional Development Schools that we will establish in the proposed project will provide better clinical experiences in the preparation programs of the University, better planned and more supportive programs to introduce new professionals to the schools, more effective professional renewal for practitioners in the schools, increased knowledge about teaching and learning through joint research, and as a net result, better instruction for students. (p. 54)

In addition, as noted earlier, the Planning Grant PDS Team had developed a number of recommendations about characteristics and outcomes desired. However, we discovered that we needed concrete examples of the concept in action, and we could get this information from locations that were currently working through the reform and from the research conducted by those who had analyzed and synthesized the process.

When the Associate Director for Professional Development Schools began work in July, 1989, one information/clarification activity was already underway. The PDS Team had commissioned an

Information and Resource Subcommittee to review the literature and develop a document that synthesized current research in three topic areas: Teacher as Researcher, PDS Concept, and Collaboration. All of the articles used to prepare this paper were subsequently cataloged and housed in the Benedum Resource Library.

A second activity, bringing two members of the University of Louisville/Jefferson County Schools enterprise to Morgantown, had been planned and was scheduled for July 12-13, 1989. Drs. Ric Hovda and Linda Shelor spent the first day meeting with PDS Team members in small groups, providing information and answering questions that had arisen through the Team's earlier work. All project participants were invited to attend the next day's session, which included brief presentations, a video from the Louisville collaboration, and further discussions of Professional Development School activities and processes. Hovda and Shelor provided insights from their own work with the concept, including:

- Professional Development Schools are a process.
- Take time to learn about each other's work and settings.
- We must be risk takers and not look for whom to blame, but should identify the problem and ask "What do we do about it?"
- This is an experiment, so there is no way you can fail -- you never fail if you learn something.
- PDS is innovation from within.

The two days of interactions with the consultants provided specific examples of what the collaborative process looked like from both the university and public school perspective. The visit provided members of the PDS Team with information that helped to clarify the PDS concept in Jefferson County Schools and that was frequently discussed as we began to formulate our own vision of Professional Development Schools.

A third activity to clarify the concept and related activities occurred in September. A group of public school and university faculty members of the PDS Team traveled to Louisville, Kentucky to visit participating schools sites. By this time, we recognized that understanding the concept and being able to envision activities was difficult for each new member of the Project and the PDS Team, and so the Project Editor videotaped interviews and documented much of the Louisville visit. Talking with teachers and administrators and observing changes in the structures of these schools provided specific examples that enabled our Project representatives to differentiate

between typical organizational patterns of schools and those that exist in the Professional Development School. The site visit helped to make the PDS concept in action more real to the Team members who participated in the trip.

Since the next step toward establishing Professional Development Schools would be to give public schools information upon which to base their decision to apply, we knew that we had to provide some clear, but probably brief, descriptive and explanatory material. The videotaped information gathered from the Louisville visit was used to create a video, and promotional brochures were prepared. Both were used, in conjunction with presentations by PDS staff members, to provide the specifics needed by public school faculties to help them to determine if they wanted to become involved in the application process.

The clarification of the PDS concept has involved many different groups through several stages of development. The PDS Team, the PDS Staff and the Benedum Management Planning Team were included in the first stage of clarification which began in the summer of 1989. These groups played a major role in providing information to the public and to school groups during Fall, 1989. As the PDS Team added more public school personnel, the new members were given the information about Professional Development Schools. By explaining the concept to the schools and to the expanded PDS team, Project staff gained an even deeper understanding of the concept. The PDS concept was further internalized by the Team members as they created the belief statements which are the guiding principles of the Benedum Project PDS sites and worked out their vision of what a PDS would "look like."

The next level of clarification is currently underway with the selected PDS sites. Each school, building from the vision it described in its application, is continuing to clarify the PDS concept with the faculty, the parents, the community and the students. This clarification of the PDS concept, like the implementation of the concept, is a process that will continue as the school's members learn more about themselves and what they hope to become.

Adding Public School Members 9/89 - 10/89: Central to the success of the PDS goal of the Benedum Project is adequate public school representation. The BMPT, as discussed in Phillips and Wolfe (1990), suggested that this could be accomplished in late September through forming an *ad hoc* advisory council to recommend a recruitment process.

This *ad hoc* council was made up of public school professionals from the four-county region around WVU. The specific composition of the group was extremely carefully planned to include representatives

from a variety of constituencies. Each of the four counties was represented by the Superintendent of Schools, a Principal, the county's Teacher of the Year, and a representative from its local education association. Monongalia County, the county in which WVU is located, had several additional members. The council met in late September 1989 and developed the nomination and selection procedure that was used in adding public school members to the Benedum Project Teams.

Over 250 nominations were received by the Nomination Committee. This group, composed of public school teachers and Project Staff, reviewed each nomination, and compiled a list of multiple nominations and membership considerations for the approximately 100 team openings. The issues involved in making the selections from the nominations included:

- determining the correct size of the team to facilitate communication and completion of tasks
- identifying the correct proportion of higher education representatives to public school personnel and teacher to administrator ratios
- balancing representation from the four counties involved
- ensuring a variety of experiences and content, school size and location, and years of teaching experience. Special care was taken to have a balance of representatives from the three instructional levels -- elementary, middle or junior high, and high school -- to provide the teams with both broader credibility and a wide range of expertise.

Guided by these considerations, the Nomination Committee recommended selections in the first week of October, and each person recommended was called and invited to join the Project. Those who accepted the invitation were then sent a packet of information to prepare them for the Project Retreat on October 13.

With the additional members recommended by the *ad hoc* group, the expanded PDS Team was composed of nineteen faculty members from higher education and thirty-five educators from the public schools. The public school members included eighteen administrators and seventeen teachers (eight elementary, four middle school, and five high school) representing eight West Virginia counties, because the original PDS Team had members from counties beyond the immediate WVU region.

Meeting of Expanded PDS Team 10/13/89: The October 13 Benedum Retreat, a Project-wide meeting described by Phillips and Wolfe (1990) and Lovell (1990), provided the first opportunity for the

new PDS Team members to consider the Team charges (see Appendix A). The Team focused on completing the following tasks from the PDS Team Charges:

- Establish documentation process/system for activities and for PDS establishment and operation
- Formulate standards/belief statements for Professional Development School participation, solicit reaction from school and university personnel and amend as needed
- Develop structure for using standards to select PDS sites.
- Carry out selection of initial PDS sites
- Support continuing collaborative efforts between the Professional Development Schools and WVU

The Team elected two co-chairs, one from the public schools and one from higher education. The co-chairs would work closely with the Associate Director for Professional Development Schools in planning and facilitating meetings and informal interactions.

Developing Belief Statements 10/89- 11/89: The first task for the expanded PDS Team was to develop the belief statements that would guide the activities in the PDS sites. Team members knew that they were not trying to develop a formula for PDS sites and that ideas or beliefs could not be imposed from the outside. Each PDS would find its own ways to achieve the vision presented in the belief statements. Understandings of the beliefs would continue to develop within the school sites among the practitioners responsible for putting them into action. The belief statements would therefore have to allow for site refinement and interpretation. The variety of experiences and knowledge brought to the belief statement development task by the members of the PDS Team helped to ensure that the statements would be representative of the visions of educators from the area.

The first decision the Team made in October was to alter the original timelines for completion of the application/selection process, because the original target date for selecting sites was December, 1989. In keeping with the shared decision-making policy of the Project, the Team developed a new schedule that called for the applications to be mailed by November 17, 1989. Applicant schools would complete and return their packets by January 5, 1990. The Review Team would then evaluate and select the schools by the end of January.

Small groups met on October 11 and 25 and participated in the identification of common beliefs about education. Team members began to envision what a PDS would look like and to translate these visions into belief statements. The early meetings of the PDS Team could be called dream sessions, for they were opportunities for participants to imagine the best that could be in schools. These sessions focused on the "what ifs," not the "can'ts" that have been barriers to many reform efforts. A modified Nominal Group Process Technique (Gepson, Martinko, and Belina, 1981) was used to identify and focus on the ideals that session participants thought were important to the PDS concept.

The Team met for a total of more than thirty-five hours during the period between October 11 and October 30 to write the belief statements. Alliances developed between members of the Team as the public school and higher education people worked together, in part because of the intensity of the interactions necessary to complete the demanding task of agreeing on the principles that would guide PDS sites. These alliances were both personal and professional, and soon the cultural differences between public school and higher education Team members were much less visible than they had been in the first meeting.

The belief statements reflect the PDS Team's focus on the concept of a *school community* as embracing more than just the administrator, teachers, and students in the school. Support staff, parents and the community at large were included in the Team's idea of a PDS community. This conception is evident in the belief statements that begin: "**All** in the school will...." The Team recognized that the changes in restructuring PDS sites must include all groups if they are to be meaningful and lasting.

Developing the Application 10/89 - 11/89: Developing the application packet and review process was a crucial step in the process of establishing Professional Development Schools. Since no other reform effort reviewed by the PDS Team had developed an application packet or competitive selection process, the group was breaking new ground.

Application work sessions began on October 25 and continued through November 9, 1989. The Team identified the criteria for selection and then developed evaluative procedures for assessing them. Determining what a characteristics were likely to be essential indicators of potential success as a PDS site was difficult for the Team. Certain provisos were part of the Project proposal, and others were developed, debated, and sometimes altered or discarded during the application development process. The following conditions became the final list of criteria for site selection:

- Schools selected will represent each of the grade categories: elementary, junior high/middle school, and senior high school.

- At least one will be a rural school.

- The sites will represent the diversity of schools in the state and region. Characteristics to be reviewed will include:
  Size
  Grade Levels
  Location/ Proximity to WVU
  Characteristic of student body
  Characteristics of faculty

- The sites will develop a collaborative relationship with WVU and will serve as sites for practicum students.

- The sites will share their successes with others.

- Applicant schools will have the endorsement of their county board of education

- Applicant schools will have the endorsement of at least 60% of their certified personnel

- Applicant schools will have the documented support of both the Superintendent and the Principal

It is interesting the rural school criterion took the most time to resolve. Members could not agree about what constitutes *rural.* Many definitions for the word can be found in the literature, and the group soon found that, using any of the definitions, most schools in West Virginia qualify as rural. The Team ultimately decided that each school would determine if it considered itself to be rural and would explain what characteristics substantiate its claim to this label.

Each application included three narrative questions: one describing how the Belief Statements relate to the applicant school as it is now or might be in the future; one envisioning new types of collaboration between WVU and the school; and a third imagining benefits to the school community if the school was chosen as a PDS site. A demographics section was included to gather information about both the student and teacher populations, and Statement of Support documents from both the Superintendent and the Principal were needed. To qualify for consideration, the applicant school had to provide evidence that 60% of the certified personnel had voted to endorse the application to be a PDS. (Interestingly, during the PDS meetings from the Planning Grant period to the completion of the PDS Beliefs and application, the percent required for support was increased from 51% to 60%. PDS Team members felt that a greater

percentage of support was needed to help to ensure success at the sites.) In keeping with the focus on the school community, the application also required evidence that parents and community members were informed about the school's application.

The application form was included in a packet of information containing a description of the Benedum Project, a listing of PDS Team members, and information about the criteria for selection and the review process. (See Appendix D) The application packet was mailed on November 16 to all of the schools (seventy in number) in the four-county area .

Election and Training of Review Team: Having worked through the complex discussions and decisions that yielded the Belief Statements and the PDS Application Packet, the PDS Team had two remaining decisions to make regarding the evaluation of applications and the selection of PDS sites: 1) what the composition of the Review Team would be, and 2) who would serve as members of this Review Team. The group decided that there should be five public school members, none from schools that were applying, and four WVU members. The nine Review Team members were then elected, and they agreed to meet with the Associate Director for Documentation, Evaluation, Research, and Evaluation soon after the application deadline. At this same meeting, the PDS Team considered the possibility of conducting site visits to gather any additional information the Review Team found necessary to make its selections. The PDS Team agreed that they would trust the professional judgment of the Review Team in determining whether such site visits or interviews were needed.

The Review Team met on January 11, 1990, for a combination of training for their evaluation tasks and individual review of one of the 14 applications that had been received. Having members apply the review procedures immediately provided the opportunity to have any questions answered and to help estimate the time needed to evaluate the applications before they left to begin the total evaluation task. Prior to the training session, Graduate Assistants assigned to the Associate Director for Professional Development Schools had summarized the data reported in each application so that the Review Team would not have to devote time to compiling this information.

Assuring that all members of the Review Team had a common understanding of the selection criteria and the Belief Statements was an important first step in the training process. As Lovell (1990) has explained, these shared conceptions would contribute to inter-rater reliability, particularly in evaluations of the narrative portions of the applications. Therefore, the Review Team members generated synonyms and comparable phrases for key terms in the criteria and

the Belief Statements, and they discussed these items to achieve consensus on the meanings.

Four sample responses had been created for each of these three narrative topics, and Review Team members read and evaluated each independently and then shared their evaluations and rationales. They then discussed the results and reached consensus on their process and decision-making.

The content of the total application packet was also discussed, and items that could and could not be compared across applications were identified. Review Team members also discussed legitimate and equitable use of the unstructured information on students, faculty, and school that each application contained. The training concluded with agreements about the confidentiality of documents, discussions, and decisions. Each member then reviewed an application individually. The Team reconvened briefly for questions; however, no problems were encountered in these independent reviews. All packets had been copied so that each member had a complete set for review. The Review Team determined the time needed to complete the review process and selected January 24 as the date to reconvene to select the PDS sites.

Review and Selection of Sites: Each member of the Review Team had been asked to evaluate and rate the applications, noting their comments and any questions they had. At the January 24 meeting, the Associate Director for Documentation, Evaluation, Research, and Dissemination, who acted as process facilitator, suggested an approach to making decisions about sites. First, individuals would rate, not rank, each individual site. The applicants would then be divided by grade levels (elementary, junior high/middle, and high schools) and individuals would rank schools within each level as strong, acceptable, or weak on the each of the three required narratives and their rating of the overall application. Next, reviewers would examine composite rankings for each school to determine top rankings across reviewers for each level. Finally, since the Project proposal called for selecting at least one rural school, they would assure that that commitment had been met.

Using this process, the Review Team reached clear agreements on a school at each level in the initial round of rankings, and two of these schools had categorized themselves as rural. With three schools selected, the Team discussed the next round of rankings. They recognized that their next decisions would be affected by the choices made in the first round, since assuring diversity among the PDS sites was another commitment in the Project proposal. Two more schools were selected in the second round of rankings, and one of the members suggested considering a sixth school that had some unique characteristics. This suggestion engendered a review of the entire

slate of schools not yet chosen in regard to size, student population, representativeness of West Virginia schools, and other factors. After ranking the pool of remaining schools, the group chose a sixth school which, interestingly, was not the one that had been proposed for reconsideration.

When the process was concluded, the PDS Team reviewed the entire slate of recommended sites. They discussed the question of whether site visits or interviews were needed, and they readily established consensus that the applications had been adequate sources of information and that no further elaboration or data were needed. They confirmed their consensus on the site recommendations.

The Review Team recommendations were presented to the Benedum Management Planning Team and thoroughly discussed with that group as well as with the Project's Principal Investigator, the Director, the Assistant to the Director, and the two Associate Directors who had been present during the training and selection meetings. The Principal Investigator then called the external evaluator to communicate the essence of these discussions and to determine her position on six, rather than four, sites. Although she still had serious concerns about the adequacy of time, people, and money resources to devote to six schools, she concurred. The site recommendations were then presented to the Benedum Foundation President and the West Virginia University President for their formal approval. When these approvals had been given, the Principal Investigator called the principals of all schools that had applied to tell them whether their school had been selected, thank them for their investment in developing the application, and praise their professional commitment.

Our Successes

The PDS Team and the Benedum Project have many successes that can identified. Described below are a few that were very critical in the development of the Benedum Project.

Thorough Planning: The fact that the grant was funded by the Benedum Foundation shows the forethought and planning of the faculty at WVU. Building upon the University commitment to educational reform and the Holmes Group Report, much time and thoughtfulness went into the planning for and planning of all phases of the grant. The weekly BMPT meetings and the bi-weekly PRIT meetings help to foresee and prevent issues from arising and enable those that do develop to be resolved quickly, before other problems can arise.

Early Involvement of Public School Personnel: It was very important to the success of the Benedum Project and the Professional

Development Schools Team in particular to include public school personnel in the earliest stages of the planning of the Project. Not only were their perspectives and expertise needed to create the documents and processes used in selecting the PDS sites, but also, without their initial participation, the Benedum Project would be another case of schools "being done to."

Reaching True Collaboration: Even with this natural competition, the PDS Team began a transformation: they began to think and act as a *TEAM*. A large part of the success of the Project has been due to the foresight of the Planning Grant authors in providing time and money to support planning and reflection at every level of the Project. This planning time gives people the chance to learn about each other and from each other.

The intensity of the interactions and commitments brought much to the flavor of the Team. Members were driven to complete the tasks in the time allotted and would not allow further revisions of the timelines. Participants looked for consensus; members represented the ideas and feelings of those members not present at a meeting ("I think ___ would have a concern about that if she were here."), and the goal became writing good documents that would represent the collective ideas of the PDS Team. Care was taken so that not just one view or perspective was presented ("We have to think about developing the best application we can and not worry about whether our school is going to apply or not."). The Team was task-oriented during this stage of the Project. The members completed the idea phase and used this knowledge to create the documents and processes necessary for the success of the PDS sites.

Change must involve many people if it is to be sustained and is to make a positive difference in the educational process. The days of believing that school improvement projects can be successfully copied from one school and superimposed upon another are no more. The Benedum Project staff believe these statements and do everything possible to support both the public school and higher education faculties in these efforts. The Team interactions have been unique because of the people and the structure that developed, just as each PDS site will have a unique organizational structure because of the variety of people involved and their leadership styles. To think that one idea will work in all situations is unrealistic and will only retard the process of change. Lasting change can not be mandated, nor does change take place with the adoption of a new textbook or the appointment of a new administrator. Shared decision-making and collaboration will allow these educational changed to take place.

If one subscribes to the definition of *teamwork* as being "coordinated action by a cooperative small group in regular contact wherein members contribute responsibly and enthusiastically toward

task achievement" (Davis, 1972), this group can truly carry the title of *Professional Development School Team.*

Providing Time: The time needed to accomplish the goals of the Project and of the PDS Team was supported by the management of the Project. Released time for educators in both the higher education setting and the public schools was written into the Project. This allowed for more a more energetic group and a more productive meeting. If all meetings had been scheduled after school, in the evenings, or on weekends, few people would have committed to the hours necessary to complete the tasks. Although many meetings are scheduled for the "after hours" time slot, it is because the teams decide upon this schedule. With the intensity of some of the PDS meetings, the participants decided not to be out of their classrooms as often and to meet at night. But this was not imposed, it was voted upon by the group.

Personal Reflections

In preparation for writing this paper, I reviewed the journal that I began in July as well as the minutes of the PDS meetings. The minutes made it very easy to recall exact incidents and interactions that happened at specific meetings. The journal allowed me to experience again the feelings and thoughts that took place from July 1989 through January 1990. So many things have affected my professional, as well as my personal, growth. There have been difficulties, rewards and surprises along the way that affected my perceptions and knowledge.

The position of Associate Director for Professional Development Schools initially appealed to my need to have an active role in improving education. Knowing the other members of the Benedum Project Management Team, I had no doubt that the Project would be a success and that I could contribute as liaison between higher education and the public schools. When I was offered the job, I did not hesitate, but accepted immediately, even though I was really not certain what was involved.

Difficulties: The difficulties I encountered in this role can be categorized into three types: managerial, personal and political. Every new job entails learning the management and organizational structure of the group, but this job, with the PDS concept still undefined and the development processes still being formulated, offered unique challenges.

After mastering the basics such as learning how to use the Macintosh computer and locate things like available office space and the necessary supplies, I began to look for an overall understanding of the Benedum Project. Having entered the Project after its two-year

planning and development phase, I found that many of the interactions and activities discussed were foreign to me. Even though the Project Proposal, Quarterly Reports and meeting minutes were provided for my use, I still found it difficult to understand the scope of the Benedum Project. I found that I could read about something, but without having experienced it, there was a difference in my perceptions. This was true of my understanding of the Project's component parts. It took me a very long time to understand all of the complexities and interrelationships of the Planning Grant, the Benedum Project PDS goal, and the Tyler model that guided the curriculum development activities. Everyone else was an owner of the Project; I was the new guy on the block, and it took many hours of reading and discussion with many people on the Project before I truly understood the whole picture.

Once I had read the literature on the Professional Development School concept, the Holmes Group and other sites that were in the process of restructuring, the concept became clearer, but it was still not perfectly focused. A real turning point in my understanding of what PDS's were all about was a visit to Louisville in September, 1989. Not only did I see the concepts in action, but I met another educator who had been through many of the same things I was encountering. She was a public school teacher who had left the classroom to help develop the PDS concept in the Jefferson County School System. I had found someone who could understand what I was going through personally. Continued contact with this person provides me with a peer who can understand how it feels to work in three cultures: higher education, public school and the Benedum Project.

The cultural differences between higher education and public schools were an early personal concern. Each group has cultural norms that help to guide its behaviors and interactions. When I became Associate Director for PDS, I became a "man without a country." I was neither a faculty member of higher education nor a public school teacher— I was a member of the Benedum Project.

It was at times difficult for me to know whom I was representing in certain situations. My colleagues in the public schools looked upon me as working at the University, while many of the university faculty saw me as a public school teacher. This difficulty can be illustrated by an example: When I used the word "we," public school personnel thought I was talking about WVU, and the higher education faculty thought I was talking about the public school setting, but I was actually talking about The Benedum Project. This called for some clarification.

The most difficult part of my position has been dealing with such a politically sensitive environment. The amount of pre-planning and re-planning that takes place to head off problems and concerns was no surprise, for I have worked with many organizations and groups where

this has been necessary. But these groups are generally single constituencies. This project must always operate within the frameworks of West Virginia University, the Benedum Project Grant, The Benedum Foundation guidelines, and four distinct public school systems. All of these constituent groups must be informed and have the opportunity for input. Because of the collaborative nature of the project, this input must be equal and be evident through every step of the process. Being proactive and not reactive and thinking through all of the possibilities from every view point has been a new task for me.

Rewards: With any new position come the difficulties, but also the rewards. I have learned much in the short time I have been involved, and I look forward to learning even more. The lessons have not been easy ones; they were learned through the processes that were being used to create the PDS concept and documents, and most were learned from those around me. This "on-the-job training" has helped me to grow personally and professionally as no college course could ever do. Being in on the ground floor of such an exciting and innovative project has been very rewarding. Knowing that what we are doing will affect the future of education in the six PDS sites and beyond is the best outcome of this position. Even if what I do is but a small part of the process, I will always be grateful that I was able to participate in the early stages of the Project.

The contacts and professional relationships I have made with members of the Professional Development School Team have been one of the biggest rewards. Not only did they complete the tasks assigned in a very professional manner and provide their expertise to the entire team, but they also reaffirmed my belief in educators; that they do care and that they are very competent indeed.

Surprises: There were also some surprises along the way. I was surprised at both the similarities and the differences between higher education and public school faculties. Both groups are teachers and care about education, but they work under different time constraints and focus. Public school personnel wanted to know what task needed to be done and how long they had to do it. Higher education faculty were more reflective and thought more about the processes to be used.

The grace with which the PDS Team put aside their titles and roles and worked in collaboration on the PDS tasks was a pleasant surprise. Even from the first meetings, it didn't seem to matter if an idea came from a principal, a superintendent, a teacher or a WVU professor. The ideas were discussed and acted upon because of their content, not their origin. No one hedged on any comment or action because of role.

I was surprised at how many people were interested in the PDS concept. Even teachers who saw themselves as "burned out" became excited about this project. Many volunteered to work on the PDS Team, and many worked on unifying their faculties to complete the PDS application to become a PDS. This happened even though specific ideas were not yet designed or fully developed.

It was difficult to keep one step ahead of the team when it was meeting twice a day, three times a week. I was surprised at the numbers of meetings with which I was involved with and how much these meetings cut into productivity. The diversity of Team members and the newness of collaborative strategies often made facilitating the group dynamics a challenge.

Are there things I would have done differently? I probably would have spent more time in the beginning studying group processes and organizational models. I would have listened more and talked less, as a good facilitator does, and I would have asked a work-study to do more of the clerical work to free up the graduate assistants and myself for more important tasks.

This has been an incredible growth period for me and I look forward to beginning the work with the six PDS sites.

REFERENCES

The College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University. (1988a). Benedum planning proposal. Morgantown, WV: Author.

The College of Human Resources and Education, West Virginia University. (1988b). Partners for progress: A collaborative project for educational improvement in West Virginia. A proposal to the Benedum Foundation. Morgantown, WV: Author.

Davis, K.(1972). Human Behavior at Work: Human Relations and Organizational Behavior, (pp. 451) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. .

DeBevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: some principles of bridgework, Educational Leadership, 43(5) 9-12.

Gepson, J., Martinko, M.J. & Belina, J. (1981). Nominal group techniques. Training and Development Journal, 35 (9), 78- 83.

Glatthorn, A. & Newberg, N. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership, Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hord, S. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration, Educational Leadership, 43(5), 22-26.

Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 28-32.

Lovell, K.C. (1990, April). Learning from a reform experiment: The documentation, evaluation, research and dissemination activities of the Benedum Project at West Virginia University. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Phillips, P. & Wolfe, J. (1990, April). Collaborating to improve teaching and teacher education: The foundations and organization of an experiment in reform. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Schlechty, P.C. & Whitford, B.L. (1988). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration, In School-University Partnerships

in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns. (pp 191-204) New York: Teachers College Press.

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the development of school-college collaboration," Educational Leadership, 43(5), 18-21.

Appendices

Appendix A

Professional Development School Team Charges

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS TEAM

The focus of the Professional Development Schools Team, which will be composed of members from the public schools and the University, is on designing and implementing strategies and activities to establish Professional Development Schools. These schools will be committed to exemplary practice, and each will identify and pursue its own projects to enhance teaching and learning. Within the parameters designated by the members of each participating school, Professional Development Schools will be sites for collaborative inquiry and development carried out jointly by members of the individual schools and of West Virginia University and will serve as clinical sites for WVU preparation programs.

The charge to the Professional Development Schools Team is to carry out the following tasks and activities:

1. Review the literature on Professional Development Schools.
2. Plan and conduct WVU/schools conference or symposium on Professional Development Schools.
3. Develop and implement publicity on Professional Development Schools for local, state, and other audiences.
4. Establish communication and public relations systems with schools, teachers, students, administrators, school boards, community, and WVU and other higher education faculty and administrators.
5. Establish documentation process/system for activities and for Professional Development Schools establishment and operation.
5. Formulate standards/belief statements for Professional Development School participation; share draft and solicit reactions from appropriate school and WVU personnel, and amend as indicated.
6. Develop structure for using standards to select Professional Development Schools.
7. Select and implement pilot projects.
8. Carry out selection of initial Professional Development School sites; design and conduct orientations.
9. Support and assist continuing collaborative efforts between the Professional Development Schools and WVU.

Appendix B

Belief Statement Session
Public School Members
Nominal Group Technique
10-11-89

Members of the Professional Development Schools Team of the Benedum Project were invited to participate in writing belief statements that will help to guide the selection and development of PDS sites.

Participants included Barbara White, Susan Donovan, Dennis Gallon, Janet Crescenzi, Jim Napolillo, Ruth Oaks, Mary Ann Seckel, Jake Seitz, Tom Hart, John George, Kelly Michael, Tom Deadrick, Greg Cartwright, Norman Adlington, Maryann Matheney, Sandra Wales, Bob Beach, Tom Lash, Gail Looney and Jake Mullett. Teresa Field and Sarah Steel assisted the facilitator of the process, Rusty Russell.

NARRATIVE

This group of public school teachers met for the first time as a team on this date. The Nominal Group Process took place in the afternoon with the morning being devoted to orientation of the team goals and charges and a discussion of "but" statements and barriers the group saw to implementation of any of the charges and goals. The group also discussed the "what if..." type of statements before retiring to a Luncheon in 802-A. The afternoon session began with the introduction of Rusty Russell and an explanation of the NGT and desired outcomes from this group.

Participants then began to list their ideas about the problem statement provided to them for this session:

Part of the Benedum Project involves establishing Professional Development Schools. Your task is to help describe the characteristics of a Professional Development School by identifying what should take place in a PDS to lead to successful teaching and learning.

The group was randomly divided into three groups. After silent brainstorming, round-robin sharing of ideas was begun within each group. The ideas from this part of the process were recorded on cards and displayed before the group. The next step involved grouping together the "like" items into categories. These categories were then given a "title" or phrase to represent that group of ideas.

At this point each small group reported to the whole group what their categories were and provided a period for clarification and question. After all three groups had reported on this phase of the process, individuals were asked to help combine any of the categories that were the same from group to group. After this task was completed, each individual selected the categories they thought were most important to the goals of the Project and a vote was taken. Twelve items were selected and sent to small groups for further work.

A statement was to be written consolidating (while incorporating) all the ideas from all three groups for each idea. Small groups were mixed at this point to ensure that representatives from each group was available as a source for information and clarification while these statements were being written.

Once the statements were written they were read and posted for the whole group to see. The final step included weighing the importance of each statement by the individual assigning points to each. (each participant was given 100 points.) These points were totaled and a numerical sum recorded for each statement.

NGT Process Responses

The following is a compilation of all the card responses from the 10-11 meeting. They are organized by the final form developed by the group. Individual cards are listed first (with original group number included.), consolidating titles next and finally, the completed written statement for each group of ideas. These ideas are listed in the rank order voted on by the group at the end of the process.

Adequate qualified support services / 3 Elimination of non-teachir g duties / 3

Shared learning-- Community, School, and Family / 1 Shared decision making / 1 Teacher input / 1

Paid team leaders / 2 Flexible scheduling / 2 Teacher teams / 2

Teachers select teachers / 2 Teacher input into policy decisions / 2 Teachers can consult with peers / 2

Teacher involvement in budget / 2 Teacher acting rather than re-acting / 2

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT

In a PDS, teachers share in the decision-making process regarding policy, budget, staff selection, staff development, flexible time scheduling, and non-instructional duties with community and administrative support.

Students are challenged /2 Small groups / 2 Goal driven / 2

Active involvement of students / 2 Data-driven decisions / 2 Innovative and creative teaching techniques-enthusiasm / 2

EMPHASIS ON ACADEMICS

A PDS school is one which emphasizes academics to challenge and actively involve all students by enthusiastically presenting innovative techniques which meet the needs of any size group, using data-based decisions to guide goal driven instruction.

Time to reflect / 2 | Teacher as researcher / 2 | Adequate planning time / 2

Staff willing to work / 2 | Observing other teachers / 2

Release time for professional development / 2 | New teacher induction program / 2

Time to consult with students / 2 | Interaction, students and teachers / 2

TEACHERS

A PDS is guided by the belief that the teacher is an individual who will work with the whole staff. She/he will be granted adequate time for planning, researching, observing, and consulting with students and professional development.

Team oriented / 3 | Idea sharing / 3 | Problem solving stressed / 3

Collaboration/ Change to improve education / 3 | Communications among all / 3

Opinions freely expressed and received / 3 | Decision processes open and orderly / 3

COMMUNICATION

A PDS school is one in which lines of communication are open, encouraging free expression among all members of the school community, in order to improve educational opportunities through idea sharing, problem solving, and team oriented approaches

Acceptance/ Change process/ Leadership to facilitate and endorse / 1 | Flexibility/ Curriculum school structure and thinking / 1

Time for experimental learning / 1 | Development of leaders / 1

Limited outside imposed goals / expectations / 1 | Changes / 1 | Encourage/ Support experimentation 1

Indepth studies, curriculum / attitude / 1

ATTITUDES

A PDS school will and foster positive attitudes which will accomplish the following Acceptance to change, flexibility, experimentation, goal oriented expectations and the development of leadership.

Raise expectations / 3 | Teach responsibility / 3 | Success oriented / 3

All are learners / 3 | All students can learn / 3 | Develop work ethic for all / 3

Positive student attitude / 3

EDUCATION IS JOB 1

Staff in the PDS school demonstrate that all are learners ; therefore expectations are raised in a success oriented atmosphere with the responsibility of the learner being emphasized.

Less stress / 3 | Students are happy / 2 | Trust / 2 | Humor / 1 | Cooperation / 3

Few interruptions / 2 | Direction is evident / 2 | Cheerful atmosphere /3 | Love/Caring/ 1

Develop self-esteem / 3 | Positive modeling / 1 | Enthusiasm and excitement / 1

People are willing to take a risk / 2 | Teachers and students individual rights respected / 3 | Success breeding/ meaningful challenges / 2

Open environment / 1 | Acceptance of student, parent, teacher responsibilities / 1 | Positive learning environment / 1

SCHOOL CLIMATE

School climate fosters the development of self-esteem, a cheerful atmosphere and a positive learning environment which breeds success through meaningful and challenging activities and respect for individual rights in a trusting, loving, and caring environment through which people are willing to take educational risks. This should develop and enhance educational excitement that may be evident by positive role modeling and the acceptance of responsibilities by students, teachers, and parents.

Flexible principal / 3 | Informed staff / 2 | Cooperative administration / 2

Administrator is instructional leader / 2 | Support of all administrators / 3

Less jargon, more doing / 3 | Strong instructional leadership / 3

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

To ensure success of a PDS school, instructional leadership will be action oriented, exhibiting and encouraging cooperation, flexibility and support of teacher based decisions. Become a leader of leaders.

Active learning process Student & staff/ 1 | Opportunity for idea exchange/ 1 | Sharing ideas/ 1 | Team Teaching/ 1

Time for individualization/ 1 | Opportunities to apply theory/ 1

ACTIVE EDUCATION

In a PDS school, active education is observable when team teaching is utilized; however there must also be time for individualization. During teaming there must be sharing of ideas to provide opportunities for theory application. The learning process is not complete without students and staff working together. Time must be spent on exchange of ideas in order to promote an indepth study of curriculum and attitudes.

Group leadership/ 1 | Meaningful staff development/ 1 | Support systems for for students & staff/ 1 | Equipment to work with/ 1

Professional release time/ 1 | Emphasis on research and writing/ 1 | Board & superintendent supportive/ 2

Paraprofessional available/ 2 | Access to materials and expertise/ 2 | Parent involvement/ 2 | Volunteers/ 2

More $/ 2 | Adequate materials and resources/ 3 | Continual leadership development program/ 1 | Sabbaticals/ 1

Teacher support of PDS/ 1 | Opportunities for professional growth/ 1 | Funding for new teacher ideas/ 1 | Access to new ideas/ 1

Professional "paper trail"/ 1 | Teachers recognized as professionals/ 2 | Raise salaries/ 3 | Time to do work/ 3

Adequate preparation time/3 | Informed and supportive community / 2 | Adequate facilities/ 3

SUPPORT SYSTEMS

A PDS has philosophical and financial support through various systems including the Board of Education, professional educators, service personnel and the community.

Community involvement/ 1 | Community education/ 1 | Extra-curriculum program/ 3

Partnerships/ 1 | Parental support/ 3 | Enrichment activities for all students/ 1

Public relations/ 1

EXPANDED EDUCATION

A PDS includes extensive community involvement which fosters community education and extracurricular activities that focus on partnerships and public relations.

Future oriented curriculum/ 3 | Related curricula/ 3 | Refine teaching skills/ 3

Updating old ideas/ 3 | Ready for change/ 3 | Common goals/ 3

CURRICULUM

A PDS curriculum is one that updates old ideas, refines teaching skills, integrates all subjects and is future-oriented.

The following ideas were developed but were not ranked high enough to write belief statements concerning the content.

Cooperation/ 1 | Provide best learning environment/ 1 | Develop better attitudes/ 3

Caring/ 3 | School climate/ 3

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Students maintain individuality/ 2 | Peer tutoring/ 2 | Students progress upward/2

Student success/ 2 | Kids grow academically, socially, emotionally/ 2

STUDENTS

Partnership in evaluation/ 2 | Monitoring/ 2

EVALUATION

STATEMENT RANKING

School climate

Support systems

Teacher empowerment

Active education

Attiudes

Teachers

Instructional leadership

Communication

Education is Job 1

Emphasis on academics

Curriculum

Expanded education

*Students

*Evaluation

*Not enough group support for devising belief statements.

Appendix C

Final Belief Statements

Belief Statements

A Professional Development School will be guided by Belief Statements, which describe what we hope a Professional Development School will become.

1. ***All in a Professional Development School are learners.***

   The focus of a Professional Development School is learning. Students, teachers, administrators and parents are all learners in a Professional Development School. Students will have the opportunity to be active learners in an environment that provides for individual needs and abilities. Teachers and administrators will share ideas and opportunities for professional development, including using and contributing to current research. This can occur in the school site as we reflect upon what we know from practice, as well as in collaboration with West Virginia University faculty. Parents and the community will learn from the activities in a Professional Development School through their involvement with the Professional Development School site.

2. ***All in a Professional Development School have the opportunity for success.***

   The members of a Professional Development School will design and implement activities and programs and develop a climate that promotes and recognizes success for all. The school community (which includes students, teachers, administrators, and parents) should be provided with opportunities for growth and challenge. All members of a Professional Development School community expect to be successful.

3. ***The organization of a Professional Development School encourages all to be empowered.***

   The interactions and organization of a Professional Development School will initiate and support the empowerment of all members of the school community. A shared decision-making approach will be used in all aspects of school life; ideas will be valued and all will be encouraged and supported in taking risks. Open communication among all groups involved in the school community is necessary for this to occur.

4. ***A Professional Development School fosters an environment of mutual respect.***

   In a Professional Development School, all respect self, the school community, and the global community. A Professional Development School will provide experiences that foster appreciation of cultural and human diversity and will promote self-esteem in the entire school community.

5. ***A Professional Development School promotes curriculum and instruction that evolves from continual review and that reflects the school's vision.***

   In a Professional Development School, the best of practice and the best of research guide review and revision of curriculum and instruction.

Appendix D

Application Packet Sent to Schools
Letter of Introduction
Additional Information
Criterion
Team Membership
Application Packet

The Benedum Project

Collaborating to Improve Education in West Virginia

November 15, 1989

Dear Mr. Myers:

Earlier this year, the College of Human Resources and Education at West Virginia University began an exciting education renewal project in collaboration with other colleges within the University and with public schools. This project, supported by a grant of one million dollars from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, has two central goals:

1) To redesign WVU's preparation program for teachers.

2) To establish three to six Professional Development Schools.

Unlike lab schools or other schools and programs with special faculties and selected students, Professional Development Schools will be *existing* public schools. The people in these schools will make a commitment to some basic beliefs about teaching and learning, and they will identify and engage in deliberate activities to make those beliefs realities. These schools will also be practicum sites for the next generation of education professionals. The concept of the Professional Development School involves collaboration, shared decision making, and true partnership with West Virginia University.

The members of the Benedum Project Professional Development Schools Team, composed of public school teachers and administrators and representatives of West Virginia University, have been working together to establish criteria and to design an appropriate and equitable process for selecting Professional Development School sites.

We are pleased to invite your school to apply to become a Professional Development School. A minimum of three and a maximum of six sites will be selected from the public schools of Marion, Monongalia, Preston, and Taylor counties.

If the idea is interesting to you and you would like further information, please contact Teresa Field, Associate Director for Professional Development Schools, at 293-5703. You may also contact your school district central office, where we have placed additional materials and a videotape that introduces the Benedum Project and provides more insight into Professional Development Schools.

We have enclosed in this packet some important background information about the Benedum Project and Professional Development Schools, a list of the Team members who contributed to the development of the criteria and site selection process, the criteria that will guide selection of sites, a brief description of how applications will be reviewed and assessed, the application form, and a ballot envelope and page of ballots.

We hope that you will join your colleagues in this innovative and exciting partnership to improve education. We urge that you involve as many faculty and administrators as possible in responding to the application materials. **The postmark deadline for application is January 5, 1990.**

Sincerely,

Neil S. Bucklew, President
West Virginia University

Diane L. Reinhard, Dean
College of Human Resources and Education

Perry D. Phillips, Director
Benedum Project

Teresa T. Field, Associate Director
for Professional Development Schools,
Benedum Project

Additional Information
Regarding the Selection of Professional Development Schools

There are several conditions that are "givens" in the selection of sites to become Professional Development Schools. Some were included in the grant proposal; others were identified during the development of the site selection process.

These conditions are listed below, and we encourage you to keep them in mind as you prepare your school's application. In order for a school to be selected as a Professional Development School site, it must:

- have the endorsement of its county Board of Education.
- have the endorsement of at least 60% of its certified personnel.
- have the documented support of both the Superintendent and the Principal.

Other considerations in the selection of Professional Development School sites include the following:

- The schools selected will represent each of the grade level categories: elementary, junior high/ middle school, and senior high school.
- At least one of the selected schools must be a rural school.
- The schools selected will represent the diversity of schools in the state and region. Characteristics that will be reviewed include, but are not limited to:
  - Size
  - Grade levels
  - Location
  - Characteristics of student body: e.g., socio-economic, academic achievement, etc.
  - Characteristics of faculty: e.g., years of experience, professional preparation, achievements, turnover, etc.
- Schools selected as Professional Development School sites will develop a collaborative relationship with West Virginia University. This collaboration will include serving as sites for a variety of practicum students.
- The schools selected will be asked to share their successes as a Professional Development School with others from outside their school.

Following are the members of the Professional Development School Team who, over the past three months, helped create the enclosed documents.

Professional Development School Staff:
Teresa T. Field, Associate Director
Mike McNally, Linda Patrick and Sarah Steel, Graduate Assistants with Professional Development Schools

Professional Development School Team Members:
Norman Adlington, Grafton High
John Andes, Education Administration
Bob Beach, Clay-Battelle
Scott Bower, Curriculum and Instruction
Greg Cartwright, Grafton High
Janet Crescenzi, East Dale Elementary
Tom Deadrick, East Fairmont High
Susan Donavan, Brookhaven Elementary
Jack Dulaney, Monongalia County Schools
Anne Fleming, Westover Junior High
John Flynn, English
Dennis Gallon, Brookhaven Elementary
John George, Morgantown High
Jeanne Gerlach, Curriculum and Instruction
Janice Goodwin, South Junior High
Tom Hart, Morgantown High
Sharon Hibbs, Barrackville Middle School
Nancy Hoffman, Curriculum and Instruction
Tom Lash, Wheeling Park High
Gail Looney, Ohio County Schools
Mary Ann Matheney, Grafton Middle School
Rogers McAvoy, Educational Psychology
David McCrory, Technology Education
Kaye McCrory, Suncrest Primary
Kelly Michael, East Fairmont High
Jake Mullett, Monongalia County Schools
Jim Napolillo, East Dale Elementary
Ruth Oaks, Central Elementary
Pat Obenauf, Curriculum and Instruction
Mike Pocid, Bridge Street Junior High
Gwen Rosenbluth, Morgantown High
Luise Savage, Special Education
Mary Anne Seckel, Central Elementary
Jake Seitz, Morgantown High
Bill Strakal, Riverside Elementary
Wendall Teets, Taylor County Schools
Sandra Wales, Bruceton High
Barbara A. White, Suncrest Junior High
Janet Zimmerman, Music Education

The Benedum Project

Professional Development School

Application

Must be *postmarked* by January 5, 1990
Submit to:

The Benedum Project
802 Allen Hall
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Belief Statements

A Professional Development School will be guided by Belief Statements, which describe what we hope a Professional Development School will become.

1. ***All in a Professional Development School are learners.***

The focus of a Professional Development School is learning. Students, teachers, administrators and parents are all learners in a Professional Development School. Students will have the opportunity to be active learners in an environment that provides for individual needs and abilities. Teachers and administrators will share ideas and opportunities for professional development, including using and contributing to current research. This can occur in the school site as we reflect upon what we know from practice, as well as in collaboration with West Virginia University faculty. Parents and the community will learn from the activities in a Professional Development School through their involvement with the Professional Development School site.

2. ***All in a Professional Development School have the opportunity for success.***

The members of a Professional Development School will design and implement activities and programs and develop a climate that promotes and recognizes success for all. The school community (which includes students, teachers, administrators, and parents) should be provided with opportunities for growth and challenge. All members of a Professional Development School community expect to be successful.

3. ***The organization of a Professional Development School encourages all to be empowered.***

The interactions and organization of a Professional Development School will initiate and support the empowerment of all members of the school community. A shared decision-making approach will be used in all aspects of school life; ideas will be valued and all will be encouraged and supported in taking risks. Open communication among all groups involved in the school community is necessary for this to occur.

4. ***A Professional Development School fosters an environment of mutual respect.***

In a Professional Development School, all respect self, the school community, and the global community. A Professional Development School will provide experiences that foster appreciation of cultural and human diversity and will promote self-esteem in the entire school community.

5. ***A Professional Development School promotes curriculum and instruction that evolves from continual review and that reflects the school's vision.***

In a Professional Development School, the best of practice and the best of research guide review and revision of curriculum and instruction.

Superintendent Support Statement

Please read the preceding belief statements and respond to the following question in the space provided.

Given the beliefs that guide a Professional Development School, how would you envision your support within the framework of your county's educational philosophy and mission statement?

Principal Support Statement

Please read the preceding belief statements and respond to the following statement and question in the space provided.

Administrator and teacher innovation and change are inherent parts of the Professional Development School belief system. How do you envision your involvement and support for shared decision-making and empowerment of all personnel in your school? How do you propose to support teachers in their desire to be innovative within the school or the classroom?

Assistant Principal(s) Endorsement _____

_____

(Principals will also need to facilitate the completion of the following section.)

Faculty Support Statement

Faculty support and active participation are crucial to the success of a Professional Development School. One of the requirements for application is that a minimum of 60% of the *certified* personnel vote to support their school's Professional Development School application. To enable maximum participation, the voting period should be one school week in duration.

Please adhere to the following voting procedures:

1. **Duplicate a sufficient number of the enclosed ballots.**
2. **Distribute ballots to all certified personnel (excluding administrators) who serve students in your school. Have each voter sign the enclosed Voter Signature Sheet when given a ballot.**
3. **Cast ballots in secret by marking the ballot and placing it in an official envelope provided in the application packet.**
4. **Have an elected faculty representative and principal count the ballots and tabulate the results on the Voting Validation Form. (Abstentions count as "no" votes.)**
5. **Report results to the faculty by the next working day.**

SAMPLE BALLOT

Professional Development Schools Ballot

☐ *I support my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

☐ *I do not support my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

Service Personnel Awareness Statement

Members of a Professional Development School believe that the total school community shares in the education of each student; therefore, it is imperative that all personnel involved with students be aware of these ideas and beliefs. Please indicate when and how the opportunity has been provided for the service personnel to become acquainted with the Professional Development School concept. ***You may attach supporting documentation (memo, newsletter, meeting agenda, etc.) if you desire.***

Date _____

How presented _____

Audience _____

Community Awareness Statement

Community support and understanding are necessary for educational success. In a Professional Development School, the total school community shares in the education of each student; therefore, it is imperative that these Professional Development School concepts be shared with the community. Please indicate how the opportunity for the parents and school community to be involved has been communicated through a PTO, Parent advisory council, or other means. ***You may attach supporting documentation (memo, newsletter, meeting agenda, etc.) if you desire.***

Date _____

How presented _____

_____

Audience _____

Vision Statements

1. ***A Professional Development School will be guided by belief statements: the beliefs are what we hope a Professional Development School will become. Please review the belief statements at the beginning of this document and reflect on these statements as they may relate to the present and future of your school. (Please respond in the space provided.)***

2. *Collaboration with West Virginia University is a part of the Professional Development School concept. How do you envision the collaboration between WVU and your school? (Please respond in the space provided.)*

3. ***What benefits do you envision for your school community if your school is selected as a Professional Development School? (Please respond in the space provided.)***

Demographics

Please identify appropriate designation.

- Elementary : Grades _____
- Junior High/Middle School: Grades _____
- High School: Grades _____
- Other: Grades _____

- Student enrollment _____

- County _____

- **Is your school a *rural school*?** _____ **If yes, why?**

- **Total years teaching experience**
  Please list the number of faculty in each category:

0-3 years _____ 4-7 years _____ 8-15 years _____ over 15 years _____

Tell us about your faculty. (Please respond in the space provided.)

Tell us about your students. (Please respond in the space provided.)

Tell us about your school. Include any information not requested in this application that you feel is important for the review team to know. (Please respond in the space provided.)

It is important that collaboration be shown through the entire Professional Development School process. Please describe the process you used to complete this application and identify those who were directly involved in the process. (Please respond in the space provided.)

Those who have signed below actively participated in the construction of this document.

Name	*Position*

Benedum Project
Professional Development School
Voting Validation Form

Sixty percent of the *certified* personnel must support the Professional Development School concept before an application can be considered. Please complete the following form and enclose with the completed application.

School _____ Date _____

Number of certified personnel in the building (excluding administrators) _____

Number of certified personnel who voted to support their school's application to become a Professional Development School:_____

Number of certified personnel who voted not to support their school's application to become a Professional Development School:_____

Percentage of certified personnel who voted to support the Professional Development School concept:_____

$$\left(\frac{\text{\# of "yes" votes}}{\text{\# of certified staff in building}}\right)$$

Principal Signature _____

Faculty Representative Signature _____

Voter Signature Sheet

Professional Development Schools Ballot

☐ ***I support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

☐ ***I do not support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

Professional Development Schools Ballot

☐ ***I support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

☐ ***I do not support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

Professional Development Schools Ballot

☐ ***I support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

☐ ***I do not support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

Professional Development Schools Ballot

☐ ***I support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

☐ ***I do not support** my school's application to become a Professional Development School.*

Appendix E

Site Selection Criterion
Givens
Criterion
Evaluation Forms

Additional Information
Regarding the Selection of Professional Development Schools

There are several conditions that are "givens" in the selection of sites to become Professional Development Schools. Some were included in the grant proposal: others were identified during the development of the site selection process.

These conditions are listed below, and we encourage you to keep them in mind as you prepare your school's application. In order for a school to be selected as a Professional Development School site, it must:

- have the endorsement of its county Board of Education.
- have the endorsement of at least 60% of its certified personnel.
- have the documented support of both the Superintendent and the Principal.

Other considerations in the selection of Professional Development School sites include the following:

- The schools selected will represent each of the grade level categories: elementary, junior high/ middle school, and senior high school.
- At least one of the selected schools must be a rural school.
- The schools selected will represent the diversity of schools in the state and region. Characteristics that will be reviewed include, but are not limited to:
  - Size
  - Grade levels
  - Location
  - Characteristics of student body: e.g., socio-economic, academic achievement, etc.
  - Characteristics of faculty: e.g., years of experience, professional preparation, achievements, turnover, etc.
- Schools selected as Professional Development School sites will develop a collaborative relationship with West Virginia University. This collaboration will include serving as sites for a variety of practicum students.
- The schools selected will be asked to share their successes as a Professional Development School with others from outside their school.

CRITERIA AND SAMPLE INDICATORS

Criterion 1: The majority of the members of the applicant school have a commitment to engage in activities to renew and restructure their school.

Some Indicators:

- The school used a collaborative process to develop the application.
- The participants in the development of the application had a clear, stated vision of how the beliefs could be applied in their school.
- A sufficient representation of the school community participated in the development of the application.
- The principal's statement indicates an understanding and endorsement of collaboration, shared decision-making, and the process required in becoming a Professional Development School.

Criterion 2: The conditions and characteristics of the applicant school combine to indicate **potential** for becoming a successful Professional Development School.

Some Indicators:

- The responses to the four sections of the application are congruent with one another and with the vision and belief statements of the Professional Development School.
- The responses in the application indicate that the members of the school can generate a variety of ideas or possibilities regarding their future in a Professional Development School.
- There is evidence in the responses in the application that the members of the school are able to focus on "what if" rather than "can't."
- The activities envisioned require collaboration.

Criterion 3: The members of the applicant school understand and endorse **collaboration**, both in their school and with WVU.

Some Indicators:

- The applicant school's response to the question addressing collaboration and partnership identifies realistic ways in which collaboration can be mutually beneficial.
- Members of the applicant school identify more possibilities than barriers in collaboration and partnership with WVU.
- The applicant school's response to collaboration is not limited to traditional and conventional school-university interactions of the past.

WORKSHEET: PDS Application Review

Name of School_____

Response Item (Check one):

___ 1. Vision statements
___ 2. Collaboration with West Virginia University
___ 3. Benefits to school community

A. Reviewer's evaluation (Circle one):

Strong Acceptable Weak

B. Rationale for the evaluation:

C. Questions:

PDS Review	Vision			Collaboration			Benefits			Overall		
	Strong	Acc.	Weak	Strong	Acc.	Weak	Strong	Acc.	Weak	Strong	Acc.	Weak
Barnes Elementary												
Central Elementary												
East Dale Elementary												
Kingwood Elementary												
Second Ward Elementary												
Summers Elementary												
Suncrest Elementary												
Grafton Middle School												
Valley Junior High School												
Bruceton High School												
East Fairmont High School												
Fairmont Senior High												
Grafton High School												
Morgantown High School												